## Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on July 26, 2007, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 14, and 20 have been amended, and claims 3-5 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amended claims may be found on page 11, lines 21-27, page 14, lines 16-24, and page 16, lines 10-15 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 12-22, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maynard (US 6,175,830) and Douglass et al. (US 2002/0040311, hereinafter "Douglass") in view of Nasypny (US 2005/0071150). Claims 3-5 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maynard, Douglass, and Nasypny in view of Kadayam et al. (US 2003/0212673, hereinafter "Kadayam").

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

1, 2, 6-9, 12-22, and 25-28

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 12-22, and 25-28 are rejected as being unpatentable over Maynard and Douglass in view of Nasypny. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a computer-implemented method for displaying one or more tagged data items proximate to a result of a search of an electronic document. The method includes: locating one or more of the search results generated by the search of the electronic document; identifying each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document within a distance from each search result using a proximity rule, wherein identifying each of the tagged data items comprises: calculating the distance between each search result and each tagged data item; and determining if the calculated distance is less than a distance criterion, wherein the distance criterion is a predetermined number of lines of text; identifying applicable

tagged data items by determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence, the grammatical semantic intelligence comprising a rule that tagged data items that satisfy the proximity rule, with respect to the one or more search results, represent facts about search terms used in generating the search of the electronic document only when the search terms are proper nouns; and displaying the one or more tagged items associated with each search result and identified as within the distance from each search result.

Maynard discusses an information management retrieval and display system for searching through an informational resource, such as a document, a number of individual documents, or a stream of information and for displaying the results of the search in a collapsible/expandable format based upon a user-selected display criteria or hierarchy. (See Maynard column 5, lines 42-52.) A hierarchy selection, of Maynard, informs a search module of the type of display format that a user wishes to see the results displayed. (See Maynard column 6, lines 46-48.) The hierarchy selection, of Maynard, will inform the search module whether or not the search results are to be displayed in an order or structure based entirely upon the information contained within the categorical tags (research-centric), if the search results are to be displayed in an order depending entirely upon the frequency of the key words or phrases present within the finite elements (conventional), or if the search results are to be displayed in an order or structure based upon a combination of the two (document-centric). (See Maynard column 6, lines 48-57.) Maynard further discusses a break module which parses through the informational resource to break up the resource (e.g., a group of documents) into finite elements. As discussed in Maynard, each finite element is usually not a single word, phrase or symbol, but is a section or portion of the resource that can be identified and isolated by the break module such as individual

document paragraphs, sub-chapters of a document, individual pages of a document, and other types of identifiable sections of a document or the entire document itself. (See Maynard column 6, lines 1-14).

Douglass discusses a computer-readable medium is provided which automatically rates web pages 12 based on pre-designated, project-based keywords 14 during research in which results are saved in association with a project 20. (See Douglass paragraph [0018].) Douglass also discusses a computer processor (on a PC on which the software is running) that applies calculation logic stored in a method 10 to automatically calculate statistics and/or relevancy ratings 24 based on keywords 14 found in the document 12 (using algorithms for frequency, location, density, proximity, Autorank and matches, for example). (See Douglass paragraph [0020].)

Nasypny discusses extracting knowledge from textual documents of search systems. A self-learning mechanism in a form of a stochastically indexed artificial intelligence system is provided which carries out a morphological analysis and a stochastic indexing of linguistic documents and carries out a semantic analysis of stochastically indexed textual documents pertaining to a given theme. Nasypny further discusses carrying out a preliminary selection of stochastically indexed fragments of textual documents comprising all word combinations of user requests, providing a link between stochastically indexed fragments of textual documents, and checking a relevancy of a brief reply to the user's request by generating an interrogative sentence from the brief reply and comparing the sentence with the user's request. (See Nasypny, paragraphs [0023] - [0035].)

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Maynard, Douglass, and Nasypny fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. For

example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose identifying applicable tagged data items by determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence, the grammatical semantic intelligence comprising a rule that tagged data items that satisfy the proximity rule, with respect to the one or more search results, represent facts about search terms used in generating the search of the electronic document only when the search terms are proper nouns.

The combination of Maynard, Douglas, and Nasypny discusses, *inter alia*, a self-instructing system for extraction of knowledge from textual documents for use in search systems in any of a plurality of given foreign languages. A mechanism provides an automatic self-instruction of the system on rules of grammatical and semantic analysis by way of equivalent transformations of stochastically indexed fragments of a text in any of given foreign languages, a logical conclusion and generation of linked semantic structures from said fragments, stochastic indexing of said structures to be represented in the form of production rules. (See Nasypny, paragraph [0354].) In contrast, amended claim 1 specifies using grammatical semantic intelligence, the grammatical semantic intelligence comprising a rule that tagged data items that satisfy the proximity rule, with respect to the one or more search results, represent facts about search terms used in generating the search of the electronic document only when the search terms are proper nouns. Thus, amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the aforementioned combination because it specifies a rule that tagged data items represents facts about search terms used in generating the search of the electronic document only when the search terms are proper nouns, while the aforementioned combination discusses production rules for representing the stochastic indexing of text fragments in foreign languages. The production

rules are directed to a self-learning mechanism in a form of a stochastically indexed artificial intelligence system and thus fail to disclose representing facts about search terms which are proper nouns, as specified in amended claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, amended claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2, 6-9, and 12-13 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Amended independent claims 14 and 20 specify similar features as amended claim 1 and are thus allowable over the combination of Maynard, Douglass, and Nasypny for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Claims 15-19, 21, and 25-28 depend from amended claims 14 and 20, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Additionally, amended claim 20 further specifies removing a tag from a displayed item associated with the one or more search results by specifying in the user interface that the item should not be categorized, wherein the user interface comprises an on-object-user interface which receives a pointing action from a computer pointing device for pointing at the displayed item, the pointing action causing the generation of a menu for removing the tag in the on-object user interface. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Maynard, Douglas, and Nasypny also fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the aforementioned additional feature. The aforementioned combination discusses, *inter alia*, the display of search results and further discusses that a categorical tag will indicate whether or not the finite element is included in the Recommendations, Measures, etc. (see Maynard column 6, lines 48-57 and column 10, lines 58-60). Amended claim 20 is patentably distinguishable from the aforementioned combination because it specifies an on-object user interface which generates a menu (in response to receiving

a pointing action) for removing the tag in the on-object user interface. In contrast, the display of search results and the categorical tag discussed in the aforementioned combination fails to disclose an on-object user interface for removing a tag. Therefore, amended claim 20 is also allowable for at least the foregoing additional reasons.

Claims 3-5 and 23-24

Claims 3-5 and 23-24 are rejected being unpatentable over Maynard, Douglass, and Nasypny in view of Kadayam. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3-5 and 23-24 depend from amended claims 1 and 20 and thus specify at least the same features. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Maynard, Douglas, Nasypny, and Kadayam fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 3-4 and 23-24.

Maynard, Douglas, and Nasypny are discussed above. Kadayam discusses an enterprise-scale system and method for searching and retrieving electronic information from disparate electronic information sources within a large organization (an intranet) and/or from the Internet. (See Kadayam paragraph [0006].) Kadayam further discusses a "federated search" architecture and system that enables a single search query from a user to be delivered in real-time to various selected islands of information. (See Kadayam paragraph [0006].) The system of Kadayam can collate results, removes duplicates and dead-links, apply composite relevance scoring, and deliver the relevant results to the user. (See Kadayam paragraph [0006].)

In addition to the discussion of Kadayam above, the Office Action relies on Kadayam for allegedly teaching the display of a user interface window for displaying content of an electronic document (see Figures 3 and 5). The additional features discussed in Kadayam however, in combination with the discussions of Maynard, Douglas, and Nasypny, fail to disclose the

features specified in claims 3-5 and 23-24. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose identifying applicable tagged data items by determining whether the each of the tagged data items present in the electronic document should be associated with the one or more search results using grammatical semantic intelligence, the grammatical semantic intelligence comprising a rule that tagged data items that satisfy the proximity rule, with respect to the one or more search results, represent facts about search terms used in generating the search of the electronic document only when the search terms are proper nouns. Thus, claims 3-5 and 23-24 are patentably distinguishable from the aforementioned combination because they specify a rule that tagged data items represents facts about search terms used in generating the search of the electronic document only when the search terms are proper nouns, while the aforementioned combination merely discusses production rules for representing the stochastic indexing of text fragments in foreign languages. The production rules are directed to a self-learning mechanism in a form of a stochastically indexed artificial intelligence system and thus fail to disclose representing facts about search terms which are proper nouns, as specified in claims 3-5 and 23-24.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Maynard, Douglass, Nasypny, and Kadayam fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 3-5 and 23-24. Therefore, these claims are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

Date: September 25, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299